

REMARKS

This amendment is offered in response to the Office Action of May 4, 2006 and is being filed concurrently with an RCE.

The Office Action rejected Claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by the Wang reference (U.S. Patent No. 6,711,418).

The Office Action asserts that the remote receiver receiving the one-way paging disclosed in the Wang reference corresponds to the claimed “broadcast receiving section”, and the local transceiver which enables the two-way paging disclosed in the Wang reference corresponds to the claimed “data accept section”. However, in the Wang reference, the reception of information is performed by the remote receiver or the local transceiver, selectively (see the Wang reference, column 5, line 50 to column 6, line 14). Therefore, the presently claimed invention, in which the reception of information is performed by both broadcasting means and reception means, is distinguishable from Wang reference. Moreover, Claim 1 has been amended to recite that the common information is necessary upon accepting the data by the communication means. Accordingly, the presently claimed invention is distinguishable from the Wang reference. Claim 2, which is dependent upon Claim 1, is allowable for similar reasons.

Similarly, Claim 3 has been amended to clarify the relationship between the information received by the broadcasting means and the information received by the reception means. In the presently claimed invention, the “receiving device synthesizes the permanent information and the variable information, thereby generating information”. Accordingly, the presently claimed invention is distinguishable from the Wang reference, in which information having no relation with each other is received by respective means. For similar reasons, Claim 4, which is dependent upon Claim 3, is allowable.

The Office Action rejected Claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over the Wang reference in view of the Mayo reference (U.S. Patent No. 5,133,081). Similarly, the Office Action rejected Claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over the Wang reference in view of the Mayo reference and further in view of the Shimomura reference (U.S. Patent No. 6,526,580).

However, the instruction received by the device disclosed in the Wang is for operating a specific device receiving the instruction, so that it is different from the information disclosed in the presently claimed invention, which indicates presence of the instruction. Therefore, in the presently claimed invention, in cases where the instruction presence information is received, the receiving device requests and accepts the instruction information. Accordingly, the presently claimed invention is patentable over the cited references.

In view of the above, each of the claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejections of the claims and to pass this application to early issue.

Respectfully submitted,



Ronald E. Brown
Registration No. 32,200

212.297.5800
Pitney Hardin LLP
7 Times Square
New York, NY 10036-7311